

TIG *Brief*

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE AIR FORCE JULY - AUGUST 2001

ANG & IG

The Complaints Process

SPOs

Short-notice inspections

EDIS

Clinics subject to inspection

PLUS

HSIs • Fraud • Audit



TIG *Brief*

JULY - AUGUST 2001

SPOs

Short-notice medical inspections

4

RELIEF ACT II

Second of two articles on the SSCRA

10

ANG & IG

The Complaints Process

14

EDIS

Clinics now subject to inspection

16

INSPECT THYSELF

AETC HQ subjects itself to inspection

22

DEPTS

Fraud in the Air Force 6

Recent Audits 7

Health Services Inspections 8

Ask the IG 9

TIG Bits/Best Practices 12

IG PROfiles 20

The Inspector General Brief

AFRP 90-1

July - August 2001

Volume 53 Number 4

GEN. MICHAEL E. RYAN

Chief of Staff, USAF

LT. GEN. RAYMOND P. HUOT

The Inspector General, USAF

COL. FRED K. WALL

Commander,

Air Force Inspection Agency

CAPT. CHRISTA L. D'ANDREA

Chief, Public Affairs

MR. JOHN CLENDENIN

Editor

TECH. SGT. KELLY GODBEY

Assistant Editor

MS. ARI ASH

Editorial Assistant

TIG Brief (ISSN 8750-376X) is published bimonthly by the Air Force Inspector General, Air Force Inspection Agency, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico 87117-5670. *TIG Brief* (AFRP 90-1) provides authoritative guidance and information to commanders, inspectors general, inspectors and other Air Force leaders at all levels of command. Periodicals mailing privileges postage paid at the United States Post Office, Albuquerque, NM 87101-9651 and additional mailing offices. Address correspondence to HQ AFIA/CVP, 9700 G Ave. SE, Suite 350V, Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-5670. E-mail address:

tigbrief@kafb.saia.af.mil

The phone number is DSN 246-1864 or commercial (505) 846-1864. You can also read the magazine online at

<http://afia.kirtland.af.mil>

No payment can be made for manuscripts submitted for publication in *TIG Brief*. Contributions are welcome, as are comments. The editor reserves the right to make editorial changes in manuscripts. Air Force organizations are authorized to reprint articles from *TIG Brief* provided proper credit is given.

The contents of this magazine are non-directive and should not be construed as instructions, regulations, technical orders or directives unless so stated.

Distribution is via direct mail. POST-

MASTER: Send address changes to: *TIG*

Brief Editor, HQ AFIA/PA, 9700 G Ave. SE, Suite 350V, Kirtland AFB, NM 87117-5670.

Cover: Air National Guard F-16. Photo by Staff Sgt. Andrew Dunaway.

FROM THE TOP



Subject:

2001 IGQ Worldwide Training Conference

On April 3-5, the Air Force Inspector General Inquiries Directorate (SAF/IGQ) hosted its worldwide training conference at the Xerox Document University in Leesburg, Va.

The objective of this year's conference was continuing education and training, with a special emphasis on improving IG performance in the field.

It was a fantastic event! IGQ facilitated a variety of activities which involved field IGs, Secretariat, Air Staff and Department of Defense organizations.

With general sessions and small-group training, almost 300 IG personnel from locations around the world participated.

We focused on ways to improve the complaints process, improve training and encourage units to get

more investigating officers trained to reduce the times to conduct investigations and improve the quality of our IG complaints investigations.

Our goal is to complete Category I investigations in 30-45 days and Category II investigations in 90-120 days.

Getting investigations done quickly and professionally is key to our IG function supporting commanders — getting people's problems resolved promptly and effectively so that they can be focused on their jobs.

Following the conference we surveyed our IG participants and they told us this year's program was outstanding and meshed superbly with their training needs. They also recommended that we hold the conference annually instead

of every two years.

In response to this feedback, I have instructed IGQ to host the conference annually beginning in April 2002.

I encourage all IGs and their staffs to work closely with IGQ over the coming year to develop a 2002 conference that meets your training needs.

I look forward to an even better conference next year!

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ray Hunt".

Lieutenant General, USAF
The Inspector General



Lt. Col. Kristine Decker

Lt. Col. David Costa

60th Medical Group, Travis AFB, Calif.

All active-duty Air Force medical facilities are now subject to a *short-notice* SPO (Sustained Performance Odyssey) inspection by AFIA (the Air Force Inspection Agency) and JCAHO (the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations).

Any facility falling within 12 to 48 months of its last survey is now only given two- to four-weeks' notice prior to the arrival of the survey team.

This is a marked departure from the old triennial survey process with its advance notification of three to six to 12 months.

SPO was developed to minimize ramp-up costs and preparation stress while at the

same time encourage a state of continuous standards compliance.

The SPO concept became a reality Feb. 5 for David Grant USAF Medical Center (DGMC), 60th Medical Group, Travis AFB, Calif.

A phone call to the command section and a follow-up fax memo let us know that our first short-notice Odyssey inspection would be conducted March 6-9.

Execution of our SPO Plan commenced immediately.

Groundwork for SPO had actually begun early the previous year. Recognizing the value and importance of a sound self-inspection program, Col. James H. Young, 60th MG commander, and his executive team evaluated the

medical group inspection program, identified several improvement opportunities and conducted a facility-wide inspection using a rejuvenated workcenter-based system.

With JCAHO and Health Services Inspection (HSI) guidelines in hand, DGMC workcenters assessed all the standards that applied to them.

To support all scored items, a Status of Compliance form documented support data such as Air Force and medical group instructions and metrics.

In addition, action plans identified strategies for continuous improvement on items scored less than 1 with forecasted dates to reach substantial compliance.

up for short-notice SPOs



Workcenters were able to identify and prioritize discrepancies using this methodology, and scores were aggregated to squadron and group level, facilitating oversight by the executive management team.

The plan for SPO preparation, while deployed earlier than expected, was logically based on the self-inspection infrastructure, as well as use of the HSI protocols and JCAHO's *The Complete Guide to the 2001 Hospital Survey Process*.

FIVE TEAMS

Five primary teams were identified and jointly coordinated by the Planning and Healthcare Improvement Office and the medical group administrator:

- *Team 1: Project Officer.* Responsible for the entire SPO Team coordination, all sched-

ules, escort responsibilities and official notifications.

- *Team 2: Logistics.* Responsible for SPO team and team chief rooms, all conference/interview

room coordination arrangements, supplies, general facility preparations, systems requirements and environment of care/building readiness.

- *Team 3: Documents.* Responsible for overall coordination and collection of documents and publication of the documents list for the SPO team. Divided into 19 sub-teams, each with a primary point of contact to correspond with the JCAHO and HSI chapter titles.

- *Team 4: Staff Preparation.* Responsible for conference/interview group coordination and scheduling of pre-SPO mock conference/interviews. Coordinated posting of up-to-date informational materials on SPO-related

topics for staff on intranet site.

- *Team 5: Presentation Briefs.* Coordinated formal SPO briefings and local storyboard presentations.

While everyone in the entire group awaited their chance to shine for the inspectors, the primary SPO coordinators and the five team POCs absorbed the majority of the impact created by the inspection/survey process.

During both the preparation phase and the actual survey, there was minimal disruption of daily routines. From the



most seasoned veteran to the newest airman, facility-wide the DGMC staff has given the new SPO process a thumbs-up.

Young said, "Self-inspection remains the key to mission readiness." ♦

FRAUD in the Air Force

Maj. Michael Richmond AFOSI/PA DSN 857-0989



False claims by contractor

An AFOSI investigation at an East Coast base concerned a contractor who had been falsely charging the Air Force for non-existent work hours.

The contractor had falsely claimed that people were working when they had, in fact, been sick or on leave.

Additionally, the contractor had made some "work-related" purchases on his personal credit card. The contractor would then fraudulently submit a claim to be reimbursed for the expense.

The claims submitted by the contractor were for more money than was actually incurred for the charged expenses.

Finally, personnel working for the contractor were supposed to be professionally certified.

Investigators identified numerous employees who had not passed their certification test. The case resulted in a \$200,000 administrative recovery for the Air Force.

False claims, Clean Water Act violations

A joint AFOSI-FBI investigation at a West Coast base, based on a sealed qui tam* lawsuit, concerned allegations that a government contractor had improperly transported and disposed of propellants and other hazardous materials without the proper environmental safeguards and permits.

Materials that were burned openly included: C-4 explosive, lead azide, lead styph-nate, hydrazine, heptane, various solvents and photograph-develop-ment chemicals.

Potentially illegal disposal activity occurred as recently as July 1999.

The case resulted in a plea agreement settlement with the contractor, who agreed to pay \$1.5 million to the government. ♦

*A *qui tam* suit can be filed by a private citizen in the name of the U.S. government, charging fraud by government contractors and other entities who receive or use government funds. The citizen may share in any money recovered. A *qui tam* suit is permitted under a provision of the Federal Civil False Claims Act.

The Air Force Office of Special Investigations investigates all types of fraud perpetrated against the government. Through our fraud investigations program, we help ensure the integrity of the Air Force acquisition process. These investigations typically involve contractor misrepresentation during the process of procuring major Air Force weapon systems. Our focus is to maintain an effective fighting force by deterring contractors from providing substan-

dard products and services, and to recover government funds obtained fraudulently. We also make significant contributions to flight safety and help protect critical Air Force resources. Other types of fraud we investigate involve military and civilian members who have been caught cheating the Air Force. Mutual command and OSI support, coupled with teamwork, is essential for successful prevention, detection and neutralization of fraud.

Write You Are!

If you have a story you'd like to tell the IG community, here's some advice on getting it into *TIG Brief*:

- **Keep it short.** Articles should be no more than 800 words (less than two double-spaced pages).
- **Keep it simple.** Stories should be told so simply that people outside the IG field can understand them.

- **Keep it moving.** Write in an active voice, which means avoiding "is, are, was and were," four words guaranteed to render readers unconscious.
- **Spell it out.** Explain jargon and spell out acronyms. Assume that you're the only one who knows what you're talking about.
- **Check it out.** Double-check your facts.
- **Check it off.** Route your manuscript through your chain of command before sending it to:

tigbrief@kafb.saia.af.mil

Recent **AUDITS**

Mr. Ray Jordan AFAA/DOO DSN 426-8013



SPRAM **assets**

A recent audit of SPRAM (Special Purpose Recoverables Authorized Maintenance) assets disclosed that personnel at one wing did not properly account for 445 SPRAM assets valued at more than \$74 million and could not locate another 24 of these assets valued at over \$753,000.

As a result of audit, management initiated action to establish additional SPRAM accounts to track all assets.

Additionally, squadron personnel located three items and agreed to investigate the remaining 21 missing items.

Report of Audit EL001008

Relocatable **facilities**

Construction at one wing of relocatable facilities (used to satisfy short-term office and storage requirements) had violated standards set by the National Fire Protection Association and OSHA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

Specifically, these facilities were not constructed of materials

meeting fire resistance rating requirements, and the hangar bays contained combustible modular structures not in compliance with fire and safety standards.

Based on audit recommendations, management removed non-compliant facilities and required responsible personnel to provide comprehensive plans of action for correcting all fire and safety violations.

Report of Audit DR001008

Mobility **planning** **and capability**

The mobility program at one wing required strengthening to ensure that the wing met its deployment mission requirements.

For example:

- Unit deployment managers did not always assign personnel to specific unit type code mobility positions.
- Individuals were not current on one or more required core immunizations.
- Mobility personnel were not current on all mobility training courses.

Management immediately started corrective actions to ensure

mission readiness would not be impaired.
Report of Audit WP001023

Drug **Testing** **Program**

A recent audit of the Air Force Drug Testing Program at one wing disclosed additional management action was needed to help ensure program effectiveness.

For example:

- The wing was four years behind in forming a required oversight committee to keep the wing commander apprised of program effectiveness.
- All unit commanders did not sign notification letters directing military members to report to designated drug testing sites.
- Medical personnel improperly delegated program responsibilities.

As a result of the audit, management:

- formed an oversight committee,
- rescinded an erroneous operating instruction, and
- released a new instruction that included current guidance.

Report of Audit EL001050

The Air Force Audit Agency provides professional and independent internal audit service to all levels of Air Force management. The reports summarized here discuss ways to improve the economy, effectiveness and efficiency of installation-level operations and, therefore, may be useful to you. Air Force officials may request copies

of these reports or a listing of recently published reports by contacting Mr. Ray Jordan at DSN 426-8013; e-mailing requests to reports@pentagon.af.mil; writing HQ AFAA/DOO, 1125 Air Force Pentagon, Washington DC 20330-1125; or accessing the AFAA home page, www.afaa.hq.af.mil.



HSIs

The Air Force Inspection Agency, as the principal action arm of the SAF/IG's inspection system, conducts Health Services Inspections. HSI's are compliance inspections of the medical programs and facilities of active-duty and Air Reserve Component units. Below is HSI-related information that military treatment facilities will find useful and even essential in their ongoing preparations for visits by AFIA's HSI teams.

The meaning of Health Services Inspections

Col. Don Geeze AFIA/SG2 donald.geeze@kafb.saia.af.mil

What is the real purpose and value of the Health Services Inspection process conducted by the Air Force Inspection Agency Medical Directorate?

The role of AFIA is "to provide objective and independent assessments." HSI's go a step further in providing *consistent Air Force-wide oversight* of medical programs and organizations *on a regular basis*.

HSI's provide consistent, standardized data that allow major command senior leaders to compare the performance of their medical facilities with others in the Air Force. HSI's also permit senior leaders at the Air Force Medical Operations Agency (AFMOA) to accurately assess the status of programs and systems across the Air Force. Finally, the HSI process contributes to the Air Force Surgeon General's assessment of the overall status of the Air Force Medical Service (AFMS) and facilitates his understanding of its weaknesses and strengths.

The consistency of the HSI process provides senior leaders a tool to measure performance of individual medical organizations as well as the status of AFMS programs across the Air Force. While major commands have a variety of excellent programs to assess performance, none of these apply to the entire Air Force. If MAJCOMs all chose to use an identical checklist to measure performance in a particular area, having different inspectors working for different organizations would still yield data that could not be compared.

Consistency is an essential ingredient for success in any endeavor, although not the only ingredient. In the business of inspecting, we also need to evaluate the validity of our inspection process — are we looking at programs and

processes that are truly important? This is a crucial question because what we inspect becomes very important to people in the field; the inspection process can drive wasted effort in emphasizing programs and processes that are not critical to the mission, and clearly this must be avoided.

How do we decide what is "truly important?" We cannot assess compliance with *all* Air Force Instructions, and some areas that are very important are simply not addressed in AFIs. Obviously the Air Force Surgeon General and his staff have a central role in deciding what we look at, as do AFMOA, AFMS consultants and MAJCOM SG staff members.

AFIA inspectors with recent experience in medical units also play a role in deciding what gets looked at. They have direct and immediate input into the process, and the *HSI Guide* is a document they use daily. Inspectors provide the conduit through which the concerns of the field are often incorporated into inspection elements. AFIA medical inspectors are the eyes and ears of senior leadership. Sometimes the information we convey is not what folks want to see or hear, but it's our job to relay it as consistently, accurately and objectively as possible.

What do HSI findings and unit ratings mean?

A *finding* means that a program or system is not functioning as expected by Air Force medical leadership. The *unit score* is a compilation of all findings. The *verbal rating* derived from the score (Mission Ready, Mission Ready with Exception, Not Mission Ready) is a way to stratify medical units based upon the number and severity of findings.

The reference to "mission readiness" in the rating should not be over-interpreted as a judgment of actual ability to fulfill a specific mission. It is simply a verbal design-

Continues on next page.



ASK the IG

What happens when I use the Department of Defense IG Hotline to file a complaint?

The purpose of the Department of Defense Hotline Program is to build public confidence and trust in the Department of Defense. It is a key element in implementing and supporting credible and responsive complaints and fraud, waste and abuse programs.

Complaints filed with an IG through a Defense Hotline are processed in a manner similar to all IG complaints. However, Hotline complaints have unique reporting requirements to Department of Defense IG. Normally, following your complaint via a Hotline, the responsible IG will attempt to contact you and clarify your concerns and the issues involved. The purpose of this contact is to gather relevant information from you in order to properly analyze the issues and determine the most appropriate resolution strategy.

In some cases the IG will refer your complaint to another agency that is better suited to resolving the matters you raised. For example: if the issues involve fraud, which is criminal wrongdoing, the IG may refer the complaint to the appropriate law enforcement agency. In other cases, the IG may refer the allegations to investigative agencies or individuals

such as the Defense Finance and Accounting Service or a primary contracting officer. If deemed appropriate, the IG will conduct an IG investigation.

If the IG refers a complaint to another agency, the IG will continue to monitor the complaint to ensure that the case is properly resolved and reporting requirements are completed. Additionally, the IG will ensure that a formal decision has been made concerning corrective actions as a result of substantiated findings.

In closing your Department of Defense Hotline complaint, the agency responsible for resolution is required to provide the Department of Defense IG with the findings by completing a Hotline Completion Report (HCR). An HCR is a stand-alone document that provides all necessary background information and communicates the results of the investigation to the Department of Defense IG. An HCR may be accompanied by additional documentation such as a law enforcement report, an IG Report of Investigation, or the results of an audit.

The Department of Defense Hotline Program is truly a valuable tool that focuses attention on areas of concern. The program provides a timely, thorough and independent response to Department of Defense stakeholders. ♦

The meaning of HSI

From previous page

nation of where a medical unit fits in the hierarchy of other medical units based on HSI findings. The assumption is that units with few findings are more mission capable than those with many.

Finally, the short-notice inspection process begun this year, Sustained Performance Odyssey, is a demonstration of the AFIA/SG philosophy. The intent is to gather more accurate data and to minimize the negative impact of periodically spinning up for inspections. To accomplish these goals requires a shift in mindset and culture in the AFMS.

The AFMS does not exist to serve AFIA/SG; AFIA/SG exists to serve the AFMS. We wish to perform our mission



of assessment in the least obtrusive manner possible. This means we hope personnel will avoid blanket cancellation of leaves and TDYs due to HSIs. If processes and systems are functioning well, we'll be able to see that with or without the people responsible for them. The converse is also true.

The HSI process, like the AFMS, is evolving to meet the needs of a changing Air Force and a changing world. What we wish to change is the long-held belief that HSIs are disruptive and unpleasant. In the process of changing, we hope to preserve those qualities which are the essence of our process: consistency, objectivity and relevance. ♦

The Soldiers PART 2 and Sailors (and Airmen) Civil Relief Act

Col. Gary Leonard AFIA/JA

gary.leonard@kafb.saia.af.mil

The May-June issue of *TIG Brief* discusses some of the salient aspects of the Soldiers and Sailors Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S. Code, Section 501 et al.

This edition's article discusses other pertinent provisions of the SSCRA, including rules on taxation of the service member's military income, taxation of real property and taxation of personal property.

Besides these taxation provisions there are important protections for professionals such as doctors and lawyers who may lose income due to being on active duty. This professional protection applies mainly to professionals who are reservists. They often see a significant reduction in income while serving on extended active duty.

TAXATION

One of the most important protections the SSCRA provides is to limit the taxation of a military member's military income and non-business personal property to the state of domicile. *Domicile* is: "That place where a man has his true, fixed, permanent home and principal establishment, and to which whenever he is absent he has the intention of returning." You only need to be on active duty to receive this protection. You do not need to be deployed.

In practical terms this means that if you are on active duty and call Nevada home but are stationed in New York you can call Nevada your "state of domicile" for tax purposes and call New York your "host state." In this case New York will not be able to tax your military income nor any real or personal property you own in Nevada. Only Nevada can tax your income and personal non-business property (such as a house or car).

If you happen to be domiciled in a state such as Nevada, which does not tax personal income, this is a real benefit.

On the professional side it became clear during Operation Desert

The SSCRA applies to active-duty members, *including* Guard and Reserve members on active duty.

Storm in 1990 that professionals such as doctors are reluctant to serve in the military due to the potential for negative financial consequences.

For instance, some doctors have practices where they make \$400,000 per year with correspondingly heavy expenses. Most importantly, they have very high premiums for professional liability insurance.

Most doctors can't continue to make the payments for this insurance on their military pay. Also, when they cancel the insurance they often have trouble having it reinstated. Most insurance carriers do not want to continue insuring doctors on duty due to the potential for claims during this period, which may include treatment of war wounds.

Some doctors find that the insurer may be willing to reinstate the insurance but only with a large increase in premiums. Thus, the consequence of leaving for an extended period could be an inability to regain their professional liability insurance and continue their medical practice once their military duty has ended.

Based on this scenario, Congress enacted a provision of the

SSCRA called Professional Liability Insurance Protection (SSCRA section 592). It protects the doctor by mandating that the insurance be reinstated by the insurance carrier upon written request of the doctor. This would normally occur once the active-duty tour that caused the cancellation is over.

Also, the insurance company cannot increase the premium unless there has been a general increase during the period of suspension.

One final note for Reserve and Guard on a related insurance topic: If you are recalled to active duty and you cancel your health insurance during your period of active duty, the SSCRA requires that insurance be restored once your active-duty tour ends if you request restoration.

This article and the previous edition's article cover the most important issues addressed by the SSCRA. If you have an issue related to civil liabilities, taxes or insurance you should contact your local staff judge advocate. The local JAG can review your particular situation, determine if the SSCRA applies and how to effect its coverage to benefit you. ♦

SSCRA applies *only* to specific situations in which duty prevents members from handling civil obligations.

The law:

- helps ensure creditors are not able to foreclose on various assets while the service member is deployed in support of U. S. military operations.
- helps to reduce the mortgage payment during the deployment.
- protects from debt obligations under certain circumstances.

The law does *not*:

- automatically apply just because one is on active duty.
- make a debt go away permanently but only delays (stays) the action for the duration of the service plus three months.

TIG BITS

*Lessons +
Best Practices
from the field*

SITS on top at Barksdale

The 917th Wing at Barksdale AFB, La., stays on top of their unit self-inspections with SITS, a new Self-Inspection Tracking System.

The database was designed to provide real-time self-inspection data on the wing's LAN (local area network). Commanders, supervisors, flight and shop chiefs can view, update and add discrepancies in seconds. Using SITS allows decision-making processes to begin immediately and problems to be addressed without delay.

The program has reduced maintenance

by more than 17,000 manhours per year in the 917th Wing. The SITS program also tracks command-inspection "crossfeeds, crosstells," compliance and operational readiness inspections, and internal work center discrepancies.

SITS has been so successful that it has been distributed throughout Air Force Reserve Command and the Air National Guard.

Tech. Sgt. Charles Shaw DSN 781-9015
charles.shaw@barksdale.af.mil



Eagle maintainers strike quickly

At RAF Lakenheath, England, the 48th Fighter Wing's *Power Team* developed a maintenance cycle for the engines in their F-15E Strike Eagles.

The primary goal of the team is to reduce maintenance-cycle time and make F-15E engine subsections readily available to build full engines.

Module maintenance cycle time was reduced by 38 percent. The number of man-hours to produce serviceable engine modules was reduced an average of 33 percent. The distance traveled during the maintenance



process was reduced 38 percent or by 248 miles per year. The process involves a seven-step cycle (combining plan, do, study and action steps) with an in-depth layout analysis of the work area.

Senior Master Sgt. Martin Brennan DSN 226-2734
martin.brennan@lakenheath.af.mil

Schriever AFB's no-notice walkabouts

To better assess their environmental programs, the 50th Space Wing at Schriever AFB, Colo., put together an *Environmental Walkabout Program* to conduct their annual ECAMP (Internal Environmental Compliance Assessment and Management Program) assessments.

Instead of conducting the assessment via the typical one-week-per-year method, every organization and facility on base receives an unannounced visit at least once per year from an ECAMP team. The findings and recommended corrective actions from each walkabout assessment are input into a database and forwarded to the appropriate agency for action. Root-cause analysis is also conducted and incorporated in the database.

Findings and results are compiled throughout the year and published in a single internal ECAMP report.

The walkabout internal ECAMP process allows for continuous assessment of an installation's compliance with environmental regulations throughout the year versus just once per year. It allows for added emphasis on problem

areas, or leadership or user identified concerns throughout the year. The no-notice concept ensures continuous compliance, prevents ramping up for the sake of an annual assessment, and minimizes the chance of violation during no-notice inspection by state and federal regulators. The program also provides instantaneous realistic assessment of the installation's compliance with environmental regulations.

Ms. Carol Ditmer
DSN 560-4026
carol.ditmer@schriever.af.mil





the ANG & the IG complaints process

Col. Stephanie K. Walsh
ANG Advisor to The Inspector General
stephanie.walsh@pentagon.af.mil

Certain aspects of the Air Force Inspector General instruction relate to the Air National Guard complaints resolution process. Active-component IGs will, no doubt, encounter ANG issues due to the current war-fighting organization of the Expeditionary Aerospace Force.

Although the Total Force concept is alive and well in the IG, some aspects of the ANG IG program remain unique. This is largely due to the difference in status of personnel in the ANG, and the fact that the IGs are “traditional” Guard members, meaning they perform UTAs (unit training activities) two days a month. Each revision of AFI 90-301, *Inspector General Complaints*, has better addressed ANG-

specific issues, and the Jan. 30, 2001, version is no exception.

Let’s look at some of the changes affecting the ANG complaint resolution process.

Possibly the most telling difference in the ANG process is who can direct investigations. In the active component and Air Force Reserve, the authority to direct investigations (the appointing authority) is generally found at a lower command level — that is, the wing commander or installation IG (AFI 90-301, paragraph 1.4.5). In the ANG, this authority has always been vested in the TAGs, The Adjutants General for each state. (The Chief, National Guard Bureau, had appointing authority before the ANG IG program began;

that is, when all investigations were completed by ANG members of the NGB IG office.) The AFI also provides that, should a TAG choose to delegate authority in writing, the state IG may be an appointing authority. This change was made to achieve parity between state IGs and installation IGs in the active component. This does not mean that a TAG must delegate appointing authority; it simply allows such a delegation should the TAG choose to do so.

The flip side of this authority is that ANG wing commanders are not included in paragraph 1.4.5. In other words, a wing commander in the ANG currently does not have appointing authority.

ANG wing commanders do, how-

ever, have the ultimate authority to select their IG. The concept of operations (CONOPS) written to guide the program's development specifically provides that the "wing commander will select, appoint and rate the individual who will serve as the IG." The appointment must be routed through the state IG and TAG, who will forward it to Secretary of the Air Force IG Inquiries Directorate (SAF/IGQ). (This notification is a prerequisite for acceptance into SAF/IGQ training.)

Although there are selectee qualifications listed in the CONOPS, a

requirement is that the IG must be a traditional Guard member, not a technician or an AGR (an ANG member serving on full-time National Guard duty) member of the Guard or Reserve on active duty. This is important for a number of reasons. Since the unit manning document position for the IG is a traditional Guard position, it must be filled with a traditional Guard member. The intent is to prevent, to the fullest extent possible, a conflict of interest that would preclude the IG from investigating a wing member. This is difficult to do if the IG works full-time in a different capacity in the wing. It places the IG in the untenable position of possibly investigating someone who, while not in the IG's chain of command during UTAs (unit training activities), may be the full-time supervisor during the week. In other words, it could result in a number of cases in which the IG is "conflicted out" of conducting an investigation, significantly reducing the IG's ability to do the job. Also, the perception of ANG members is important — having a traditional Guard member as the IG makes it much less likely that

the clientele will perceive the IG as someone who is "part of the problem."

Another important issue is continuity. The CONOPS recommends that an IG be assigned for at least three years so that the resources used to train the IG and the time spent in learning the job are not wasted. The IG position takes time to understand and manage effectively, and history has taught us that one year is not long enough.

There are valid reasons why a commander might want a more permanent IG presence in the command.

The Air National Guard Installation Inspector General Program, which turns 2 years old in July, has steadily matured. With the help of the 54 Adjutants General (TAGs), state IGs and wing commanders, a majority of the 88 authorized ANG IG positions have been filled.

Many states have chosen to add IG positions either at the ANG state headquarters, in the state IG office or both. These "out-of-hide" positions are analogous to the "associate unit" IGs governed by AFI 90-301, paragraph 1.5, and are authorized.

Although commanders have the

authority to appoint these IGs, they may not do so without prior written approval of SAF/IG. This ensures that SAF/IG is aware of all individuals acting as IGs and that they have been trained. Appointment requires only a simple letter signed by the TAG or appropriate commander requesting authorization to appoint an associate IG.

A much-needed change to the AFI can be found in the *Terms* section of Attachment 1. Due to the overwhelming number of requests from the field, the definitions of "chain of command" and "designated commanders" have been expanded. Both definitions now specifically describe who in the ANG structure may accept protected communications under 10 U.S. Code 1034. The chain of command begins with the first ANG "commander" who possesses

authority to impose "Uniform Code of Military Justice" punishment on the complainant under any code of military justice applicable while in Title 32 (non-federal) status. However, for ANG "commanders" without any type of "UCMJ" authority while in Title 32 status, the chain begins with the squadron commander — or the equivalent — over the complainant and continues to every superior commander in that chain of command. This includes section commanders, if so designated, but does not include command chief master sergeants, first sergeants, vice commanders or deputy commanders. We highly recommend that IGs seek assistance from their judge advocates when trying to decide whether a particular commander fits the definition.

Those are the ANG-specific AFI revisions that might be most frequently encountered in the ANG and active component IG practice.

ANG IG TRAINING

The IGs in the 88 authorized ANG IG positions, or any associate IG positions must be properly appointed before they will be accepted into the SAF/IG one-week Installation Inspector General Course. An IG in one of the 88 authorized positions must work with the local training office to obtain a slot in the IIGTC. SAF/IGQ will work directly with associate or state IGs.

The course is taught six to eight times a year and fills up quickly. It's best to apply for the training as soon as the SAF/IG letter arrives acknowledging appointment as the IG.

Remember: One Air Force, one IG. This was the goal when the ANG Installation IG Program began, and it continues to grow and mature with every new look at the process.

SAF/IG solicits comments and recommended improvements. Our internal goal is to continue to bridge the gap between the active component and ANG processes. With continued vigilance, we believe we can develop a final product that will be useful to all. ♦



educational & developmental intervention services

EDIS clinics
now subject
to inspection

Lt. Col. Patricia Moseley HQ AFIA/SGI
pat.moseley@kafb.saia.af.mil dsn 246-1517



The Sustained Performance Odyssey inspection process now includes Educational and Developmental Intervention Services clinics.

JCAHO (the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations) views EDIS clinics as creditable and, therefore, part of the survey process. JCAHO requested that the Air Force Inspection Agency review health care in EDIS clinics.

AFIA's Medical Operations Directorate, which is charged with inspecting all Air Force medical facilities, now also evaluates medical care as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of medical management in EDIS clinics during SPOs.

SPOs are short-notice inspections to get an accurate picture of a medical facility's provision of health care on a day-to-day basis. Emphasis has shifted from *inspection preparedness* to *sustained performance*.

EDIS clinics will participate in a beta test of new inspection criteria during their SPOs. The test is a

first-time look at a particular program using newly developed inspection criteria. The goal is to determine a "fit" between the inspection tools and what is examined.

EDIS clinics serve the eligible children of military members and civilian personnel overseas who require medical intervention to support their educational needs. Early intervention services (EIS) are for infants and toddlers from birth to 3 years old, while medically-related services (MRS) are for preschool and school-age children from 3 to 21 years of age.

EDIS clinics offer a full array of medical services designed for children and adolescents with special needs.

Air Force medical treatment facilities hosting EDIS clinics are at Aviano Air Base, Italy, RAF Lakenheath, United Kingdom, and Spangdahlem Air Base, Germany. EDIS activities at Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, and Lajes Field, Azores, are provided regularly by medical personnel on temporary duty from the larger U.S. Air Forces in Europe EDIS clinics.

Stateside, the only Air Force EDIS clinics are at Maxwell AFB, Ala., and Robins AFB, Ga. At these two installations, EIS is for eligible children from birth to 3 years old whose families reside in base quarters. Beta tests of EDIS element criteria were conducted in these stateside

clinics in November.

At stateside bases without EDIS clinics, children of military members needing medical services to support their educational needs can obtain them within each state. This may be one reason Air Force EDIS programs are not as well known stateside.

Dependents with special needs are enrolled in the Exceptional Family Member Program (EFMP), regardless of a sponsor's duty assignment. EFMP is a medical program that is also inspected during an SPO.

Overarching guidance for EDIS is found in IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The Department of Defense administers, monitors and funds IDEA programs. Legal mandates exist for early intervention services, special education and medically-related services.

Mandates also afford procedural safeguards and due-process entitlement for parents and children with disabilities. The key concept is a free and appropriate public education for all Americans.

Medical services supporting functional independence and academic attainment are a focus of EDIS.

THE OPERATIONAL PROCESS

EDIS element criteria have been developed in cooperation with the Air Force EFMP consultant, refined by a panel of subject matter experts and beta-tested at two locations. Inspection items are pro-

gram- and process-oriented and are related to health care access, adequacy and acceptability.

Major command and Air Force program managers will further review the tools. Posting the element criteria on the AFIA website (www.afia.kirtland.af.mil) will add an avenue for public comment. During beta testing, results are *not* included in a medical treatment facility's SPO rating. Derived findings are shared with JCAHO.

EDIS element criteria are also program- and process-oriented, covering efforts in the community to identify eligible children and adolescents, the completion of assessments and diagnostic evaluations. The criteria are also used to assess multidisciplinary team determinations of eligibility, including parent and provider participation; the provision of treatment and services in accordance with individualized plans; transition activities; procedural safeguards; due process entitlement; and program management.

EDIS makes a difference by providing medical interventions for developmental disabilities that affect learning, thus increasing the potential for healthy functioning and positive educational outcomes. ♦

The author is a medical inspector for AFIA. She holds a doctorate in social work from the University of Georgia and a master's degree in social work from the University of Pennsylvania.





Here are the winners of the 2000 Leaf Awards announced recently by Lt. Gen. Raymond P. Huot, The Inspector General.

The award is named for Lt. Gen. (retired) Howard W. Leaf, Inspector General in the late '70s and early '80s.



MASTER SGT. MARK HENDERSON

Air Force Materiel Command

Command Aircraft Maintenance Inspector

- Key member of elite four-member team that created the Air Force's only Maintenance Standardization and Evaluation Program (MSEP) — in four months
- Lead eight-member team reinvestigating the catastrophic loss of a KC-135
- Team lead for first-ever inspection of Support Center Pacific Depot at Kadena Air Base, Japan
- Picked for elite corps of inspectors to do first-ever IG inspection of a major Air Force contractor

- AFMC's expert on aircraft electronic/environmental control systems maintenance
- Worked tirelessly with the AFMC Materiel Control Policy director to identify policy problems
- Recommended 38 policy improvements
- Built 32 briefings to articulate MSEP message
- The answerman for tool control and foreign object damage program issues
- Designed, built, implemented a comprehensive MSEP website
- AFMC/LG requested his help rewriting command tool control policy
- Uncovered a significant problem with untracked, unaccountable and unrecovered parts at air logistics centers

CAPT. JOHN FREY

Air Mobility Command

Chief, Engineer/Services Inspections

- Pointman for entire AMC/IG inspection guide/checklist to incorporate Expeditionary Operational Readiness Inspection, Mission Essential Tasks
- Built plan for the inaugural IG exercise that brought together 148 Unit Type Codes from 21 units
- Conducted previsits to each IGX site to validate team requirements
- Developed ATSO (Ability To Survive and Operate) ground rules for team
- Developed long-range inspection forecasting tool
- Stepped up as Survival Recovery Center UTC chief, Headquarters Deputy Team chief
- Twice AMC/IG Company Grade Officer of the Quarter
- Helped craft major command Confined Spaces Special Interest Item
- Reduced previous PHOENIX TENT assets by half, saving \$80,000
- Expanded and enhanced web pages for five functional areas
- Worked with Air Force Reserve Command to develop a damage simulation site
- Hand-picked to represent AMC at St Louis' first weapons of mass destruction exercise



Frey (left) with Chief Master Sgt. Daniel Dodson



Readers Speak



Tech. Sgt. Kelly Godbey
Assistant Editor

kelly.godbey@kafb.saia.af.mil

The March-April *TIG Brief* included a readership survey. We wanted to know who was reading the magazine and what they thought of it.

We placed a 12-question survey in the magazine and on the *TIG Brief* web page. The great majority of responses were positive, but the negative com-

ments will also help us make the magazine a more effective product. We've already started laying the groundwork for improvement. Here is some of the information our survey generated:

- The largest single group of respondents, 40 percent, were from the active-duty force.
- Guard members made up the next largest group at nearly 26 percent, followed by civilians at 21.

The ranks of readers fell largely into two of our survey categories: 31 percent were master sergeants to chief master sergeants while 30 percent were majors to colonels.

We also tried to determine the functional areas people work in and what roles they play in their organizations. More than 43 percent were in support functions, while 33 percent were supervisors or staff members.

The last half of the survey was devoted to finding out what you thought of *TIG Brief* and how often you were reading it. While we target *TIG Brief* to inspectors and commanders, we try to produce articles and information that anyone reading the magazine will find useful in their jobs.

The questions covered overall magazine quality, variety of articles,

use of color and graphics, whether the articles help in your job and the sections you find most useful. The survey revealed that:

- 87 percent thought the overall quality of the magazine was good or excellent (46 percent and 41.3 percent, respectively.)
- 84 percent of respondents said that the variety of articles was good or excellent (50.8 percent and 33.3 percent, respectively.)
- 77 percent deemed our use of graphics and color to be good or excellent, (41.3 good and 36.5 excellent.)
- 38 percent of respondents found *TIG Bits*, our lessons-learned section, to be their favorite part of magazine.
- 22 percent indicated that our feature articles were their choice.
- Our articles either *often* or *always* help in your jobs (32.3 percent and 16.1, respectively).
- 42 percent responded that our articles *sometimes* helped in their jobs.

After publication distribution offices closed throughout the Air Force, we were very interested in finding out how readers were getting *TIG Brief*. Nearly 46 percent received the magazine directly through the mail, while almost 30 percent read an office or lobby copy.

A number of respondents took the time to make specific suggestions, and we're taking them all under consideration. Thanks to all who responded. ♦



IG PROfiles

Job Description: Both of this edition's Pros are responsible for the authoring, coordination and issuance of Air National Guard Inspection Policy, to include schedule coordination, inspection criteria and overall policy affecting the entire ANG. Both are also

National Guard Bureau gatekeepers responsible for monitoring the inspection/assessment footprint on the entire ANG. And both advise NGB senior staff of systemic trends that affect compliance and the operational capability of ANG units.

Master Sgt. Raymond W. Carney



Duty Title: NCO In Charge, Inspections (Air)

Duty Station: National Guard Bureau, Office of the Inspector General, Arlington, Va.

Air Force Specialty: Information Management

Hometown: Bridgeton, N.J.

Years in Air Force: 16

Volunteer Work: Youth soccer coach



Lt. Col. Tom McClain

Duty Title: Chief, Inspections (Air)

Duty Station: National Guard Bureau, Office of the Inspector General

Air Force Specialty: Fighter Pilot

Hometown: Mendon, Mich.

Years in Air Force: 26

Volunteer Work: Church clerk and trustee

Old. Older. Oldest.

That's us. Since 1943, we've been serving up heaping helpings of useful information to improve the Air Force. From the ways you do business to the ways you prepare for inspections.
Get old. Get *TIG Brief*.

To subscribe,
e-mail tigbrief@kafb.saia.af.mil
and leave your name, unit mailing address, DSN and number of copies required.



Inspect Thyself

a MAJCOM HQ
subjects itself
to compliance
inspection

Maj. Bruce Gunn AETC/IGISS bruce.gunn@randolph.af.mil DSN 487-2169

Headquarters Air Education and Training Command subjects itself to compliance inspection by its own inspector general.

Believing that it should be inspected in some form, HQ AETC first gave a lot of thought to what form inspection should take. To determine that, they looked at what types of functions a headquarters performs. They boiled them down to two main areas:

- primary, directive type duties
- administrative duties

AETC concluded that their IG should steer clear of inspecting functional duties, since that would be more appropriate for a self-inspection program rather than an IG inspection. Moreover, any inspection of functional areas should be left to the Air Force, which determines major commands' unique duties. Regulatory guidance for MAJCOM staffs is such that it can be difficult for their own IG to evaluate compliance. Also, the Air Staff would have to develop the checklists to be used by the inspectors, since only the Air Staff is in a position to determine what it expects of MAJCOMs.

But when it comes to administrative duties, MAJCOM headquarters perform many of the same tasks as wings and in the same manner. Consider, for example, the Government Purchase Card, equipment management, security, computer security, resource advisor or commander's support staff operation.

ADDITIONAL DUTIES?

AETC believes in inspecting additional duties. They are all programs that, if not properly tended, can get a commander in hot water.

AETC understands as well as any organization the importance of taking good care of the resources in their stewardship to preclude the possibility of fraud, waste and abuse. Many additional duties are also items that the Financial Manager's Integrity Act requires commanders to review regularly.

If Congress could pass an act that would have units focus on stewardship of resources, which is exactly what the Integrity Act is, that says something. Those items merit more respect than some in the Air Force sometimes give them.

WHERE THE HQ COMPLIANCE INSPECTION FITS IN

The HQ compliance inspection (HCI) gives the MAJCOM commander a chance to see whether HQ resources are being properly managed. AETC expects its units to properly manage resources and holds unit commanders responsible; the same expectation is



made of the MAJCOM functional staffs.
To HCI or Not to HCI?

HQ AETC recently conducted an HCI and asked for feedback.

Directors were asked, "Was the HCI of value to your organization?" Nearly all stated that it made them take definitive looks at key programs.

For some, it proved to be a unit-building exercise, bringing units together – as inspections always do.

AETC/IG has found the HCI to be a useful tool that meets the goals the command set out to achieve. ♦

HISTORY *brief*

On this day ...

... in July

July 1, 1946: The Army Air Force Technical Training Command is redesignated Air Training Command.

July 3, 1950: The Air Force directs implementation of aircrew training in ATC.

July 1, 1953: Basic military training input to Parks AFB, Calif., is suspended to allow phaseout.

July 27, 1953: Korean conflict ends. During this conflict, ATC graduates 11,947 basic pilots.

July 19, 1954: Atomic, biological and chemical warfare delivery training for bomber crews begins at Randolph AFB, Texas.

July 1, 1983: Air University is realigned from ATC and redesignated as a major command.

July 15, 1986: Specialized undergraduate navigator training



ing replaces the standard navigator training at Mather AFB, Calif.

July 1, 1993: Air Training Command and Air University undergo significant changes. The Air Force consolidates aircrew training in ATC and transfers associated bases from Air Combat Command and Air Mobility Command.

... in August

Aug. 1, 1948: Sheppard AFB, Texas, which had been closed since August 1946, reopens as a basic military training base.



Aug. 1, 1951: Parks AFB, Calif., becomes a basic military training center.

Aug. 10, 1964: ATC begins deploying weapons mechanic officers and airmen to Southeast Asia for 179-day TDYs under Project Top Dog.

August 1969: Keesler AFB, Miss., personnel help in relief and recovery operations after Hurricane Camille strikes the Gulfport, Miss., area Aug. 17.

August 1971: Project Peace Echo, which started in April 1968, concludes. During the project, ATC trained 1,297 Israeli Air Force personnel in the F-4 Phantom.

Aug. 26, 1976: The first women pilot candidates begin flight screening at Hondo Municipal Airport, Texas, prior to entering undergraduate pilot training at Williams AFB, Ariz.

EDITORIAL DEADLINES

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DUE DATE</u>
NOV - DEC	AUG 24, 01
JAN - FEB	OCT 26, 01
MAR - APR	JAN 4, '02
MAY - JUN	MAR 8, '02
JUL - AUG	MAY 3, '02
SEP - OCT	JUL 8, '02

SEND ITEMS TO:

TIGBRIEF@HAFB.SAIA
.AF.MIL OR

9700 G AVE SE
KIRTLAND AFB, NM
87117-5670



TIG Brief

Please



Recycle

Serving U.S. Air Power for 57 Years